

- Dkt. No. 7 (Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law): the client names in the proposed redactions on pages 1–3, 8, 10–11, 13, 19, and 22;
- Dkt. No. 10 (Declaration of Niall Murphy): the client names in the proposed redactions in paragraphs 11–15, 22, and 34;
- Dkt. No. 10-2 (Exhibit B to the Declaration of Niall Murphy): the client names appearing on pages 2 and 3 of the letter (pages 3 and 4 of the document). The same redactions are permitted for the identical document submitted as Dkt. No. 45-8 (Exhibit H to the Declaration of Niall Murphy);
- Dkt. No. 10-3 (Exhibit C to the Declaration of Niall Murphy): the client names appearing on pages 1 and 2 of the letter (pages 2 and 3 of the document). The same redactions are permitted for the identical document submitted as Dkt. No. 45-9 (Exhibit I to the Declaration of Niall Murphy);
- Dkt. No. 10-4 (Exhibit D to the Declaration of Niall Murphy): the client names appearing on pages 2 and 4 of the letter (pages 3 and 5 of the documents). The same redactions are permitted for the identical document submitted as Dkt. No. 45-11 (Exhibit K to the Declaration of Niall Murphy);
- Dkt. No. 12 (Declaration of Lucy Oulton): the client names in the proposed redactions in paragraphs 28, 34, 37, and 40;
- Dkt. Nos. 12-7, 12-8, 12-9, 12-10 (Exhibits H, I, J, and K to the Declaration of Lucy Oulton): the information the Court previously allowed to be redacted pursuant to the Court's order at Dkt. No. 135;
- Dkt. No. 12-15 (Exhibit U to the Declaration of Lucy Oulton): the client name

appearing in the e-mails, as well as the dollar figure appearing in the e-mail sent on July 21, 2020 at 8:53:45 BST. The same redactions are permitted for the identical document submitted as Dkt. No. 47-4 (Exhibit BB to the Declaration of Lucy Oulton);

- Dkt. No. 14 (Declaration of Keith Turco): all proposed redactions except for the proposed redaction at paragraph 7 beginning “where and when the fish was hatched...,” which is language that appears unredacted in the Declaration of Keith Turco filed at Dkt. No. 48;
- Dkt. No. 43 (Plaintiff’s Memorandum of Law): the client names contained in the proposed redactions on pages 1–3, 8–9, 11–12, 15–17, 20, 25 and 28;
- Dkt. No. 45 (Declaration of Niall Murphy): the client names in the proposed redactions in paragraphs 39–43, 50–51, and 66;
- Dkt. No. 47 (Declaration of Lucy Oulton): the client names in the proposed redactions in paragraphs 29–33, 40, 43, and 53–56;
- Dkt. No. 49 (Declaration of Keith Turco): all proposed redactions except for the proposed redactions at paragraph 7 of the words “farmed salmon” and “product,” which is language that appears unredacted in the Declaration of Keith Turco filed at Dkt. No. 13;
- Dkt. Nos. 45-2, 45-3, 45-4, 45-5 (Exhibits B, C, D, and E to the Declaration of Niall Murphy): the information the Court previously allowed to be redacted pursuant to the Court’s order at Dkt. No. 135;
- Dkt. No. 59 (Defendant’s Memorandum of Law): the client names in the proposed redactions on pages 5, 14–17, 29, and 30;
- Dkt. No. 60 (Declaration of Paul Chamandy): the client names in the proposed redactions in paragraphs 3, 13–19, and 22;
- Dkt. No. 63 (Declaration of Michael Colarossi): the client names in the proposed redactions in paragraphs 7–9;
- Dkt. No. 65 (Declaration of Mario Katusic): the client names in the proposed redactions in paragraphs 15, 18, 44, 45, 53–59;
- Dkt. No. 67 (Declaration of Julie Vargas): the client names in the proposed redactions in paragraphs 4–11, 26, and 30;
- Dkt. No. 69 (Declaration of Jonathan Aitken): the client names in the proposed redactions in paragraphs 5, 17–31, 35, 36, and 50;
- Dkt. No. 71 (Declaration of Michael Barton): the pricing model information in the proposed redactions in paragraph 8, as well as the client names in the proposed redactions in paragraphs 9–18;
- Dkt. No. 63-1 (Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Michael Colarossi): the client names appearing on the first page of the e-mail printout (page 2 of the document); and
- Dkt. No. 75 (Plaintiff’s Reply Memorandum of Law): the client names in the proposed redactions on pages 3–4 and 7–10.

It is further ORDERED that the following documents be unsealed and that the parties refile these documents on the public docket:

- Exhibit A to the Declaration of Niall Murphy filed at Dkt. Nos. 9 and 10;
- Exhibits B, D, E, F, G, and T to the Declaration of Lucy Oulton filed at Dkt. Nos. 11

and 12;

- Exhibits A, E, G, and L to the Declaration of Niall Murphy filed at Dkt. Nos. 44 and 45;
- Exhibits A, AA, B, D, E, F, G, GG, HH, II, JJ, V, W, X, Y, and Z to the Declaration of Lucy Oulton filed at Dkt. Nos. 46 and 47;
- Exhibit A to the Declaration of Dominique Guinard filed at Dkt. No. 50;
- Exhibits H, I, J, MM, R, S, SS, and U to the Declaration of Seth Harrington filed at Dkt. Nos. 51 and 52;
- Exhibits 1 and 5 to the Declaration of Mario Katusic filed at Dkt. Nos. 64 and 65;
- Exhibits 2 and 11 to the Declaration of Julie Vargas filed at Dkt. Nos. 66 and 67;
- Exhibits 2, 4, and 5 to the Declaration of Attorney Joseph R. Klinicki filed at Dkt. Nos. 72 and 73; and
- Exhibits PX-115, PX-117, and PX-118 to the Supplemental Declaration of Seth Harrington filed at Dkt. Nos. 77 and 78.

It is further ORDERED that the parties shall, no later than December 17, 2021, indicate the redactions they still seek, in light of the Court's orders related to sealing, by submitting under seal in ECF copies of the following documents with the text of the proposed redactions highlighted so that it can be easily viewed by the Court:

- Exhibits C, L, M, S, and V to the Declaration of Lucy Oulton filed at Dkt. Nos. 11 and 12;
- Exhibits C and D to the Declaration of Keith Turco filed at Dkt. Nos. 13 and 14;
- Exhibit J to the Declaration of Niall Murphy filed at Dkt. Nos. 44 and 45;
- Exhibits C, CC, DD, EEFF, H, I, J, K, L, M, O, P, Q, R, S, T, and U to the Declaration of Lucy Oulton filed at Dkt. Nos. 46 and 47;
- Exhibits D and E to the Declaration of Keith Turco filed at Dkt. Nos. 48 and 49;
- Declaration of Dominique Guinard filed at Dkt. No. 50;
- Exhibits A, AA, B, BB, C, CC, D, DD, E, EE, F, FF, G, GG, HH, II, JJ, K, KK, L, LL, M, N, NN, O, OO, Q, QQ, RR, T, TT, UU, V, VV, W, WW, X, XX, Y, and Z to Declaration of Seth Harrington filed at Dkt. Nos. 51 and 52;
- Exhibits 4 and 6 to the Declaration of Paul Chamandy filed at Dkt. Nos. 60 and 61;
- Exhibits 3–7 to the Declaration of Julie Vargas filed at Dkt. Nos. 66 and 67;
- Exhibits 1–6 to the Declaration of Jonathan Aitken filed at Dkt. Nos. 68 and 69;
- Exhibits 1, 3, and 6–8 to the Declaration of Attorney Joseph R. Klinicki filed at Dkt. Nos. 72 and 73;
- Exhibits PX-105–PX-114, PX-116, PX-119, PX-120; and
- Answer and Counterclaims submitted as a fully redacted document at Dkt. No. 84.

Where the same document has been submitted multiple times, the proposed redactions must be the same for each of the identical documents. The parties should further indicate to the Court which documents that are the subject of redaction requests are duplicates. Failure to submit proposed redactions in the body of the document will result in a denial of any request to redact that document, and it will be publicly filed on ECF.

It is further ORDERED that the following documents shall remain under seal:

- Exhibit N to the Declaration of Lucy Oulton filed at Dkt. Nos. 46 and 47;


- Exhibit C to the Declaration of Keith Turco filed at Dkt. Nos. 48 and 49; and
- Exhibit 4 to the Declaration of Mario Katusic filed at Dkt. Nos. 64 and 65.

To the extent the parties request permission to now file on the docket Exhibits P and PP to the Declaration of Seth Harrington filed at Dkt. Nos. 51 and 52, which the parties represent were not actually filed on the docket under seal, *see* Dkt. No. 165-1 at 41, that request is denied. Those documents were apparently meant to be submitted in support of the since-resolved motion for preliminary injunction. The Court sees no reason to have them placed on the docket now.

The letter-motion at Dkt. No. 80 to seal portions of the May 18, 2021 hearing transcript is DENIED. The dial-in information for that conference was public, and the transcript has been on the docket and available to the public for months. Similarly, the letter-motion at Dkt. No. 100 to seal portions of the June 29, 2021 and July 8, 2021 hearing transcripts is DENIED. Members of the public were permitted to attend and listen into those hearings. The information contained in these transcripts is thus already in public domain and cannot be withdrawn from it.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 10, 2021  
New York, New York

---

LEWIS J. LIMAN  
United States District Judge